

I recently sent this to the Sinclair corporation:

Isn't "electioneering communications" a federal offense? In fact, didn't Bush sign the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 banning corporate giants such as Sinclair from doing something as unscrupulous as what you intend to do by broadcasting the "special news event?" (RE: Anti-Kerry documentary)

This type of unethical and self-serving corporate action on your behalf does not merit the use of public airwaves.

My complaint will be registered with the FCC.

GM

To this I will add the following: Please take some action to restore an ounce of faith in government, from the public.

Corporations with big money can change the course of an election. It just isn't fair use. It just isn't right, and this system needs to be changed.

Gus Monzon

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.